A SIMULTANEOUS [11C]RACLOPRIDE POSITRON EMISSION TOMOGRAPHY AND FUNCTIONAL MAGNETIC RESONANCE IMAGING INVESTIGATION OF STRIATAL DOPAMINE BINDING IN ANHEDONIA

Rachel D. Phillips[a], Erin Walsh[b], Nicole R. Zürcher[g], David Lalush[c], Jessica Kinard[d], Chieh-En Tseng[g], Paul Cernasov[a], Delia Kan[d], Kaitlin Cummings[a], Lisalynn Kelley[e], David Campbell[e], Daniel Dillon[f], Diego A. Pizzagalli[f], David Izquierdo-Garcia[g], Jacob Hooker[g], Moria Smoski[e], Gabriel S. Dichter[a,b,d]

a. Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27514.
b. Department of Psychiatry, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 57514.
c. Joint Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, USA
d. Carolina Institute for Developmental Disabilities, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Medicine, Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27510.
e. Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences, Duke University, Durham, NC 27710
f. Center for Depression, Anxiety and Stress Research, McLean Hospital, Belmont, MA & Department of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School
g. Athinoula A. Martinos Center for Biomedical Imaging, Department of Radiology, Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Charlestown, MA, 02129, USA

Corresponding Author:
Gabriel Dichter, PhD
dichter@med.unc.edu

Keywords: anhedonia, dopamine, PET-MR, reward, mesolimbic, self-reported stress

Abstract

Background

Anhedonia has been hypothesized to be associated with blunted mesocorticolimbic dopamine (DA) functioning in samples with major depressive disorder characterized by anhedonia. The purpose of this study was to examine linkages between striatal DA binding, reward circuitry functioning, anhedonia, and, in an exploratory fashion, self-reported stress, in a transdiagnostic anhedonic sample.

Methods

Participants with and without clinically impairing anhedonia completed a reward-processing task during simultaneous positron emission tomography and magnetic resonance (PET-MR) imaging with [^{11}C]raclopride, a DA D2/D3 receptor antagonist that selectively binds to striatal DA receptors.

Results

Relative to controls, the anhedonia group exhibited increased [^{11}C]raclopride binding potential (BP_{ND}) in response to rewards, interpreted as decreased phasic DA release, in the left putamen, caudate, and nucleus accumbens and right putamen and pallidum. Functional MRI responses to rewards did not reveal any group differences at a corrected threshold. General functional connectivity (GFC) findings showed blunted connectivity between PET-derived striatal seeds and subcortical and cortical target regions (i.e., bilateral caudate, putamen, pallidum, medial prefrontal cortex, anterior cingulate cortex, and thalamus) in the anhedonia group. Associations were identified between anhedonia severity and the magnitude of phasic DA release to rewards in the left putamen, but not mesocorticolimbic GFC. We did not find evidence of associations

between self-reported stress and striatal DA response to rewards, mesocorticolimbic fMRI activation, or GFC in the anhedonic sample.

Conclusions

Overall, results provide evidence for reduced striatal DA functioning during reward processing and blunted mesocorticolimbic network functional connectivity in a transdiagnostic sample with clinically significant anhedonia.

Introduction

Anhedonia is thought to be characterized by impaired reward processing and blunted mesocorticolimbic dopamine (DA) system functioning (1–3). This ascending DA tract passes through reward learning (-meso), cognitive control (-cortico), and emotional (-limbic) hubs of the brain (Berridge & Robinson, 2003), and impairments in motivation and the anticipation of rewards are associated with alterations in tonic striatal DA tone, phasic DA release, and DA signaling (3–6). Associations between anhedonia and mesocorticolimbic DA system functioning have primarily been investigated in major depressive disorder (MDD) (7,8). While anhedonia is a core symptom of MDD, it is also a transdiagnostic symptom that is pervasive across numerous neuropsychiatric disorders (9). A putative neural mechanism of anhedonia is striatal hypoactivation, and anhedonia severity negatively correlates with ventral striatal activity during the anticipation of rewards in depressed populations (10–12). Anhedonia severity is also associated with altered intrinsic functional connectivity between striatal regions and areas of the prefrontal cortex (PFC) in adolescents (11) and adults (13,14). In a non-clinical adult sample, reduced nucleus accumbens response to reward was uniquely related to anhedonia severity, and not depressive or anxious symptoms (15). Together these findings demonstrate distinct patterns of mesocorticolimbic DA system activation and connectivity associated with anhedonia.

Simultaneous positron emission tomography and magnetic resonance (PET-MR) imaging using [^{11}C]raclopride, a radioligand that allows for the quantification of DA D2/D3 receptor binding, has demonstrated that functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) activation and functional connectivity in mesolimbic brain regions during reward anticipation correlate with ventral striatal DA release in MDD (16) and non-clinical (17) samples. Anhedonia is associated with altered DA functioning, including decreased striatal DA transporter availability in MDD (8)

and increased striatal DA D2/D3 receptor availability in MDD (7), although no association between anhedonia and DA release capacity in MDD has been reported (18). This inconsistency may be explained, in part, by the diagnostic heterogeneity of MDD as opposed to sampling an anhedonic phenotype.

Additionally, alterations in DA signaling, transmission, and reward circuitry functioning are associated with stress. Stress is believed to induce anhedonia via downregulation of mesocorticolimbic DA system functioning (3,6,19,20). In rodents, following chronic stress, DA release in the nucleus accumbens is inhibited, and this inhibition is associated with learned helplessness, anhedonic behaviors, and coping failure (21). In particular, uncontrollable and unpredictable stressors lead to the development of anhedonic-like phenotypes in animals (22–24). Stress is also associated with impaired reward processing characterized by reduced goal-directed behavior, motivation, and reward responsiveness in clinical samples (3,25,26). Behaviorally, self-reported stress is also associated with blunted incentive motivation and altered reward anticipation (3,27). However, no research has examined associations between self-reported stress, anhedonia, and striatal dopamine functioning in a transdiagnostic sample.

In the present study, we used concurrent simultaneous PET-MR imaging with the D2/D3 dopamine receptor antagonist [^{11}C]raclopride in a transdiagnostic sample of adults with clinically impairing anhedonia. Our goal was to investigate relationships between anhedonia, striatal DA release, and mesocorticolimbic network functioning during reward processing. We hypothesized that the transdiagnostic anhedonia group would be characterized by decreased striatal phasic DA release to rewards, indexed by the non-displaceable binding potential (BP_{ND}) of [^{11}C]raclopride, relative to a control group. We also hypothesized that striatal DA functioning would predict anhedonia severity. Next, we predicted that the anhedonia group would show decreased

mesocorticolimbic network activation and connectivity during reward processing using fMRI. Finally, an exploratory aim was to examine associations between self-reported stress, anhedonia, and mesocorticolimbic DA system functioning. This aim was exploratory given that participants were not recruited based on stress exposure. We hypothesized that greater self-reported stress would be inversely associated with striatal DA release and mesocorticolimbic network fMRI activation and connectivity during reward processing.

Methods

Study Overview

The present study complements an ongoing 5-year NIMH-funded clinical trial (R61/R33 MH110027) investigating the effects of a novel anhedonia treatment on neural responses to rewards and anhedonia symptoms (ClinicalTrials.gov Identifiers NCT02874534 and NCT04036136). Data from control participants, recruited as part of a separate study, have been reported previously (28). These companion studies met research standards for Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval at UNC-Chapel Hill and Duke University, and PET imaging protocols were approved by the UNC Radioactive Drug Research Committee. PET-MR imaging data acquisition occurred within four weeks of completing inclusion and exclusion assessment for the companion study. Written informed consent was obtained prior to inclusion in the study.

Participants

Eligibility Criteria

Eligible participants in the ANH group were 18 to 50 years old, treatment-seeking for clinically significant anhedonia (i.e., Snaith-Hamilton Pleasure Scale (SHAPS) scores greater than or equal to 20 using the ordinal scoring of Franken and colleagues (29) and with Clinician's Global Impression Scale Severity (CGI-S; (30) scores greater than or equal to 3, indicating clinical impairment). Eligible participants in the CON group had no present or past psychiatric diagnoses, as assessed by the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-5 (SCID-5-RV) (31). Additional eligibility criteria are provided in the Supplemental Materials IA.

Twenty-eight ANH participants and 23 CON participants completed PET-MR scans. Three ANH participants and 11 CON participants were excluded due to problems with the PET injection or scanner (4 CON participants), PET infusion (2 ANH participants), or technical errors

at the scan (1 ANH and 7 CON participants). The final sample included 25 ANH participants and 12 CON participants.

Clinical Diagnostic & Symptom Measures

The SCID-5-RV was used to assess eligibility and for clinical characterization. Only participants in the ANH group completed self-report measures assessing stress and anhedonia severity.

The Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-14) was the primary measure of self-reported stress. The PSS assesses self-reported unpredictable and uncontrollable stressors over the past month and contains 14 items rated on a 1 (never) to 4 (very often) scale (32). Total scores range from 0 to 40, whereby higher scores indicate greater perceived stress (33).

The posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) Checklist (PCL-5), the secondary measure of self-reported stress, was used to assess PTSD symptoms in the last month. The PCL-5 is a well-validated scale with 20 items (34). Total scores range from 0 to 80, whereby higher scores indicate greater severity of symptoms. The PCL-5 version used in the current study did not include the Criterion A component. Therefore, scores may reflect general distress in relation to stressful life events rather than a Criterion A trauma (35).

The Snaith–Hamilton Pleasure Scale (SHAPS) was the primary measure of anhedonia. The SHAPS is a well-validated 14-item questionnaire that assesses hedonic capacity. Total scores range from 14 to 56, whereby higher scores indicate greater anhedonia severity in the present state (i.e., “the last few days”).

The Beck Depression Inventory (BDI-II) was administered to assess depression symptom severity. The BDI-II is a 21-item questionnaire that assesses depression severity. Total scores range from 0 to 63, whereby higher scores indicate greater depressive severity. The BDI-II

Anhedonia Subscale was used as a secondary measure of anhedonia. This comprises four items from the BDI-II (i.e., loss of interest, loss of pleasure, loss of interest in sex, and loss of energy) (36). Whereas the SHAPS primarily assesses aspects of consummatory reward, or pleasure, the BDI-II anhedonia subscale captures aspects of both consummatory and anticipatory reward processing (36). The reliability of the BDI-II anhedonia subscale is adequate (Cronbach's α = .60) (36).

Neuroimaging Data

Simultaneous PET-MR scan protocol

Participants completed a 75-minute simultaneous PET-MR scan on a Siemens Biograph mMR scanner. A bolus+infusion protocol (*Figure 1*) was implemented for PET-MR scanning, using the D2/D3 antagonist [^{11}C]raclopride, which selectively binds to striatal DA receptors (37). Dynamic PET acquisition for [^{11}C]raclopride used a planned K_{bol} of 105 min, administered using a Medrad® Spectris Solaris® EP MR Injection System. See *Figure 1* for timing of data collection by modality.



Figure 1. Timing of data collection, data modelling, and participant behavior during scanning. Three task blocks were presented during which fMRI data were collected simultaneously to the PET acquisition.

Reward task during PET and fMRI scanning

The reward task used during scanning is described in Supplemental Materials IC and illustrated in Figure 2.



Figure 2. PET-MR Monetary Incentive Delay (MID) Task.
Each trial consisted of a cue phase and an outcome phase. Trials were presented first in a neutral block that consisted of only neutral trials and then in two reward blocks that consisted of reward trials of varying magnitudes (small, medium, or large). The relationship between cue identity and

outcome magnitude had to be learned by experience. Further details of the PET-MR Monetary Incentive Delay (MID) Task are provided in the Supplemental Materials IC.

PET Analysis

[^{11}C]Raclopride is a D2/D3 receptor antagonist, and therefore competes with endogenous DA for receptors. Binding potential (BP_{ND}), the ratio of selectively bound ligand to non-displaceable ligand in the tissue at equilibrium, was estimated from dynamic PET images for the neutral and reward blocks of the MID task per subject. BP_{ND} was quantified using the two-part simplified reference tissue model (SRTM) (38). Here, reward blocks encompass trials during which participants both anticipated and received rewards. Baseline BP_{ND} and change in BP_{ND} following reward task onset (Δ BP_{ND} %) measured DA functioning during baseline (tonic) and activation (phasic) states. This approach measures the extent to which endogenous DA displaces the radiotracer. A typical, or adaptive, DA response to rewards in the striatum would be indicated by lower BP_{ND} values during reward, relative to neutral, indicating that DA has increased and out-competed the tracer for binding sites (7). Accordingly, decreased BP_{ND} indicates increased DA release.

To identify regions that showed between-group differences in BP_{ND} from neutral to reward phases of the MID, for each subject, we estimated striatal DA functioning during each condition of the task. A *z*-score statistical map representing the difference between groups and conditions (ANH > CON; Reward>Neutral) was created from subject images by contrasting voxel-wise BP_{ND} (Reward > Neutral) maps. This *z*-score statistical map was then thresholded at $z > 2.58$ and anatomically constrained to the striatum (i.e., bilateral caudate, putamen, pallidum, and nucleus accumbens) using masks from the Harvard-Oxford probabilistic atlas.

For each significant functionally-defined cluster that emerged from this contrast, condition-specific BP_{ND} values were extracted per participant. To study the pattern of results in

greater detail, these values were then compared by evaluating group (ANH, CON) × condition (reward, neutral) interactions via analyses of variance (ANOVAs). For a complete description of PET analyses see the Supplemental Materials IB and (39).

fMRI Image Preprocessing & Motion

See Supplemental Materials ID for additional details about fMRI Image Preprocessing & Motion.

fMRI Activation Analysis

To examine fMRI responses during reward anticipation, BOLD responses to reward trials of all magnitudes (small, medium, and large) vs. neutral cues were examined from cue onset to the end of the fixation period (i.e., during the cue and the target). To examine fMRI responses during reward processing, activation to successful vs. unsuccessful outcomes on reward trials of all magnitudes (small, medium, and large) were examined. See Supplemental Materials IF for additional details about fMRI activation analyses.

fMRI Connectivity Analysis

A general functional connectivity (GFC) approach examined whole-brain connectivity using striatal PET-derived seed regions that displayed significant differences in BP_{ND} between neutral and reward blocks of the MID task. GFC, a method that combines resting-state and task fMRI data, offers better test-retest reliability and higher estimates of heritability than intrinsic connectivity estimates from the same amount of resting-state data alone (40). In the current study, the combination of two resting-state runs and three MID task blocks yielded approximately 45 minutes of fMRI data for connectivity analyses. This is critical given that >25 min of fMRI data are needed to reliably detect individual differences in connectivity (41). Voxel-wise whole-brain connectivity was evaluated using the CONN Toolbox's seed-to-voxel analysis.

Analyses corrected for multiple comparisons using a false-discovery rate (FDR) approach, at the familywise error (FWE) rate of $p < .05$.

Associations between PET-MR, Anhedonia, and Self-Reported Stress

To examine whether anhedonia severity and self-reported stress were associated with striatal DA function and mesocorticolimbic network functioning, we conducted statistical regression models in R, version 4.0.3 (42). PET-derived striatal BP_{ND} and network functional connectivity values (i.e., fMRI-derived correlations between network regions with correlated BOLD signal change) were tested as individual predictors of anhedonia severity (i.e., SHAPS and BDI anhedonia subscale), in separate regressions. Additional regressions tested whether self-reported stress (i.e., PSS and PCL-5) predicted the magnitudes of these PET- and fMRI-derived variables. Corrections for multiple comparisons were made within each set of hypotheses (i.e., correcting across regression analyses that examined whether striatal DA release, or BP_{ND}, predicted anhedonia severity).

Lastly, bivariate Pearson correlations between clinical and PET-MR variables of interest were explored. Corrections for multiple comparisons were made within each set of analyses (i.e., clinical variables with striatal BP_{ND} values and clinical variables with network functional connectivity values) using the false-discovery rate (FDR) method (43).

Results

Participant Characteristics

Table 1 summarizes demographic information and descriptive statistics for the samples.

Table 2 reports clinical characteristics for the ANH group.

	Anhedonia Group (n=25)			**Control Group** (n=12)			**Total Sample** (n=37)		
Variable	*M*	*SD*	*Range*	*M*	*SD*	*Range*	*M*	*SD*	*Range*
Age	26.32	6.01	19-42	25.67	4.30	21-36	26.40	5.49	19-42
Variable	*Count*		*Percent*	*Count*		*Percent*	*Count*		*Percent*
Sex									
Female	15		(60.0%)	2		(16.7%)	17		(45.9%)
Male	10		(40.0%)	10		(83.3%)	20		(54.1%)
Race									
White	13		(52.0%)	8		(66.7%)	21		(56.8%)
Black / African American	3		(12.0%)	2		(16.7%)	5		(13.5%)
Asian	7		(28.0%)	1		(8.3%)	8		(21.6%)
American Indian / Alaska Native	1		(4.0%)	-		-	1		(2.7%)
Other (Not Listed)	2		(8.0%)	-		-	2		(5.4%)
Not Reported	-		-	1		(8.3%)	1		(2.7%)
Ethnicity									
Hispanic	4		(16.0%)	2		(16.7%)	6		(16.2%)
Non-Hispanic	21		(84.0%)	10		(83.3%)	31		(83.8%)
Education									
High School	-		-	1		(8.3%)	1		(2.7%)
Some College	4		(16.0%)	-		-	4		(10.8%)
Associate Degree	1		(4.0%)	1		(8.3%)	2		(5.4%)
Bachelor's Degree	13		(52.0%)	6		(50.0%)	19		(51.4%)
Master's Degree	7		(28.0%)	2		(16.7%)	9		(24.3%)
Doctoral or Professional Degree	-		-	2		(16.7%)	2		(5.4%)
Annual Income									
Up to $10,000	2		(8.0%)	2		(16.7%)	4		(10.8%)
$10,001 to $40,000	7		(28.0%)	3		(25.0%)	10		(270%)
$40,001 to $70,000	6		(24.0%)	5		(41.7%)	11		(29.7%)
$70,001 to $100,000	5		(20.0%)	1		(8.3%)	6		(16.2%)
$100,001 to $130,000	3		(12.0%)	-		-	3		(8.1%)
$130,001 to $160,000	1		(4.0%)	-		-	1		(2.7%)
$230,001 to $260,000	1		(4.0%)	-		-	1		(2.7%)
Not provided	-		-	1		(8.3%)	1		(2.7%)

Table 1. Sample Characteristics.
Note – Participants were able to endorse one or more race categories.

	Anhedonia Group (n=25)		
Variable	*M*	*SD*	*Range*
PSS	20.84	3.64	13 - 27
SHAPS	36.64	4.37	30 - 45
BDI-II Anhedonia Subscale	5.04	2.03	2 - 9
BDI-II Total	20.20	9.12	3 - 41
PCL-5	19.12	12.38	1 - 43
Primary Diagnosis (SCID-IV)			
No Current Diagnosis	6	(24%)	
Major Depressive Disorder (MDD)	9	(36%)	
Persistent Depressive Disorder (PDD)	3	(12%)	
Generalized Anxiety Disorder	3	(12%)	
Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD)	2	(8%)	
Specific Phobia	1	(4%)	
Other Specified Anxiety Disorder	1	(4%)	

Table 2. Anhedonia Group Clinical Characteristics.
PSS – Perceived Stress Scale; SHAPS – Snaith-Hamilton Pleasure Scale; BDI-II – Beck Depression Inventory; PCL-5 – Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Checklist; SCID-IV – Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-5.

ANH and CON groups did not differ in age ($t(28.7) = -0.14$, $p = .887$). There were significantly fewer females in the CON group ($\chi^2(1) = 6.13$, $p = .013$). [^{11}C]Raclopride dose differed between groups; for the ANH and CON groups, the average dose was 13.27 mCi (*SD* = 1.28) and 11.73 mCi (*SD* = 2.14), respectively ($t(14.9) = 2.31$, $p = .036$). Analyses controlling for sex and [11C]Raclopride dose are reported in the Supplemental Materials IID.

ANH participants reported moderate levels of anhedonia, as assessed by the SHAPS, as well as moderate depressive symptoms, as assessed by the BDI-II (44). ANH participants' PSS scores reflect moderate levels of stress (45), and PCL-5 scores reflect mild stress (34). Five ANH participants had PCL-5 scores of 33 or greater, indicating clinically significant PTSD symptoms.

Within the ANH group, males reported significantly greater perceived stress on the PSS than females ($t(22.7) = -2.73$, $p = .011$). Anhedonia severity ratings did not differ by sex. In the ANH group, scores on the SHAPS and BDI-II anhedonia subscale were positively correlated ($r = 0.65$, $p = .0005$) and PSS and BDI-II anhedonia subscale scores were positively correlated ($r =$

0.47, p = .0179). Six ANH participants did not meet criteria for any current diagnoses; however, each had a CGI-S score of 3, indicating clinical impairment. See Supplemental Materials IIA for task reaction time and valence ratings analyses.

Striatal Dopaminergic Functioning

Group Differences in BP_{ND} during the MID Task (Reward – Neutral Conditions)

Striatal clusters in the left putamen, right putamen and pallidum, left caudate, and left nucleus accumbens (NAc), extending into the left putamen, demonstrated between-group differences in BP_{ND} values (ANH > CON) for the Reward > Neutral contrast, F's(1,20) > 7.38, p's < .01. See *Table 3* for striatal cluster statistics. *Figure 3* shows [^{11}C]raclopride BP_{ND} values for each participant by condition and group. Relative to CON participants, ANH participants showed higher [^{11}C]raclopride BP_{ND} during the reward condition relative to the neutral condition (*Figure 3*). This finding indicates that, relative to CON participants, ANH participants exhibited reduced phasic DA release to rewards in the striatum. Results for exploratory PET analyses are reported in the Supplemental Materials IIB-IIE.

Cluster Label	*Cluster Size*	*Max Z value*	*Max X*	*Max Y*	*Max Z*	*Group x Condition Interaction p-value*
Left putamen	88	4.70	-22	4	12	.0007**
Right putamen/pallidum	23	3.63	18	6	-4	.007**
Left caudate	23	3.33	-16	4	14	.010*
Left NAc and putamen	19	3.45	-12	6	-8	.009*

Table 3. Striatal Clusters demonstrating ANH > CON Group Differences at a cluster-corrected threshold of z > 2.58.
Contrast of ANH > CON; Reward > Neutral BP_{ND} values. MNI Coordinates. For all clusters, the Group (ANH, CON) × Condition (Reward, Neutral) interaction effect on [^{11}C]raclopride BP_{ND} values were significant. *p*-values <.05*, <.01**, <.001***. NAc, Nucleus Accumbens. ANH, Anhedonia participants. CON, Control participants.



Figure 3. [^{11}C]Raclopride binding potential in functionally-defined striatal clusters demonstrating group differences for the contrast of (ANH > CON; Reward > Neutral). T-tests shown here (blue lines) are within-group comparisons of BP_{ND} values (Reward > Neutral) and between-group comparisons of BP_{ND} values (Neutral). In each of these four clusters, there was a significant group × condition interaction, F's(1,20) > 7.38, p's < .010. The neutral phase depicted here encompasses the first 42 minutes of scanning (i.e., a measure of tonic DA at baseline).

fMRI Activation

Results of fMRI activation analyses are presented in the Supplemental Materials IIF. These analyses showed a single between-group difference in right caudate activation, at an uncorrected threshold, which was not associated with clinical measures of anhedonia or self-reported stress.

fMRI Connectivity

PET-derived Seed-based General Functional Connectivity

Whole-brain GFC analysis revealed several significant group differences. PET-derived seeds demonstrated negative connectivity with subcortical and cortical regions in the ANH group, relative to the CON group. Target regions of these seeds included structures commonly implicated in reward processing, including bilateral caudate, putamen, and pallidum, as well as the medial prefrontal cortex. Associated regions in the anterior cingulate cortex and the thalamus were also identified as target regions. See *Table 4* for connectivity statistics. *Figure 4* illustrates group differences in GFC between the PET-derived seeds and their respective target regions.

Seed *Target Label*	Cluster Size (voxels)	Size *p*-FWE	Size *p*-FDR	Size *p*-unc	Peak *p*-FWE	Peak *p*-unc
Left Putamen						
Bilateral Striatum (-22, 0, 6)	786	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000
Right Striatum (18, 6, 8)	603	.000	.000	.000	.009	.000
Right Superior Frontal Gyrus (22, -4, 62)	87	.010	.006	.000	.997	.000
Right Putamen / Pallidum						
Right Striatum (18, 8, -8)	268	.000	.000	.000	.003	.000
Right Paracingulate Gyrus / Anterior Cingulate Gyrus (2, 36, 26)	78	.014	.008	.000	.159	.000
Right Caudate (12, 6, 12)	54	.085	.033	.001	.975	.000
Left Caudate						
Bilateral Striatum / Left Thalamus (18, 18, -4)	515	.000	.000	.000	.397	.000
Left Caudate (-16, 10, 20)	324	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000
Left Striatum (-24, 2, -12)	99	.005	.002	.000	.987	.000
Left Caudate / Thalamus (-10, -12, 16)	69	.035	.011	.000	.148	.000
Left Nucleus Accumbens and Putamen						
Left Striatum (-14 6, -12)	268	.000	.000	.000	.003	.000
Medial Frontal Cortex (-8, 50, -16)	57	.065	.038	.001	.978	.000

Table 4. Statistics for clusters demonstrating ANH > CON group difference in GFC seed-to-voxel analysis with PET-derived seeds.
Size p-values indicate the significance of the size of the target cluster (voxels). Peak p-values indicate the significance of the signal of the target cluster, at its peak, or strongest point of connectivity. FWE, family-wise error. FDR, false-discovery rate. Unc, uncorrected. FWE and FDR are two common methods for correction of multiple comparisons. Unc p-values have not been corrected for multiple comparisons. ANH, Anhedonia participants. CON, Control participants.



Figure 4. Group differences in general functional connectivity of PET-derived seeds. Seed-to-voxel analysis (ANH>CON) controlling for age and sex. Only negative connectivity values were found in the ANH group, represented in blue. PET striatal seeds are presented in radiologic view, so the left and right are reversed. ANH, Anhedonia participants. CON, Control participants.

Relations between Anhedonia and Mesocorticolimbic Network Functioning

Anhedonia and Phasic DA Release in Functionally-defined Striatal Clusters (PET)

In the ANH group, we examined associations between BP_{ND} values in the above striatal clusters that demonstrated group differences and anhedonia severity scores on the SHAPS and BDI-II anhedonia subscale. Reduced phasic DA release to rewards in the left putamen cluster significantly predicted BDI-II anhedonia scores (β_{STD} = .47, SE = 0.18, t = 2.57, p = .017, p_{FDR} = .137) (*Figure 5*). BDI-II anhedonia subscale scores were not significantly associated with phasic DA in the other three striatal clusters (p's > .05). SHAPS scores were not significantly associated with phasic DA release in any of the four striatal clusters (p's > .05). Results for exploratory analyses with anhedonia severity are reported in the Supplemental Materials IIG-IIH.



Figure 5. Phasic DA release to rewards in the functionally-defined left putamen striatal cluster predicts BDI-II anhedonia subscale scores for anhedonic participants (n=25). In ANH participants, greater [^{11}C]raclopride BP$_{ND}$ was associated with greater anhedonia severity on the BDI-II anhedonia subscale. Positive BP$_{ND}$ values represent decreased phasic DA release to rewards, relative to neutral stimuli, on the MID task. BDI-II, Beck Depression Inventory.

Anhedonia and Mesocorticolimbic Network Connectivity (PET-MR)

Neither the SHAPS nor BDI-II anhedonia subscale were significantly associated with PET-derived GFC strength for any region pairs ($p > .05$) (see *Figure 6*).

Relations between Self-Reported Stress and Mesocorticolimbic Network Functioning

Self-Reported Stress and Phasic DA Release to Rewards in Functionally-defined Striatal ROIs (PET)

Analyses with the PSS and PCL-5 yielded no significant associations between self-reported stress and mesocorticolimbic phasic DA release to rewards in striatal clusters. Results for exploratory analyses with self-reported stress are reported in the Supplemental Materials III-IIJ.

Self-Reported Stress and Mesocorticolimbic Network Connectivity (PET-MR)

Exploratory analyses with the PCL-5 yielded one significant association with GFC between the PET-derived right putamen and pallidum cluster and a target region in the paracingulate and anterior cingulate cortex; however, this association between PCL-5 scores and GFC was not significant after FDR-correction for multiple comparisons. Scores on the PSS were not significantly associated with mesocorticolimbic network connectivity.

Correlations between [^{11}C]Raclopride Binding Potential, fMRI Network Connectivity, and Clinical Measures

Figure 6 summarizes bivariate Pearson correlations in the ANH group between primary and secondary clinical measures of stress and anhedonia, [^{11}C]raclopride binding potential in striatal clusters demonstrating group differences, and general functional connectivity of these striatal clusters with their respective whole-brain target regions. As hypothesized, greater [^{11}C]raclopride binding potential (i.e., reduced striatal DA release to rewards) in striatal clusters tended to be negatively associated with general functional connectivity values of these seeds and their target regions (see *Figure 6, orange boxes in lower triangle*). However, not all of these correlations remained after an FDR-correction for multiple comparisons (see *Figure 6, upper right triangle*).



Figure 6. Pearson correlation matrix for variables of interest.
Pearson correlation values range from -1 to 1. Only significant correlations ($p < .05$) are displayed. Correlations presented in the upper right triangle of the matrix are corrected for multiple comparisons, using the false-discovery rate (FDR) method. Correlations in the lower left triangle are uncorrected. L, left. R, right. GFC, general functional connectivity. Put, Putamen. Pall, Pallidum. NAc, Nucleus Accumbens. BP_{ND}, binding potential non-displacement. SHAPS, Snaith-Hamilton Pleasure Scale. PCL-5, PTSD Checklist for DSM-5. BDI, Beck Depression Inventory.

Discussion

This investigation explored associations between anhedonia, striatal DA binding, and reward circuitry functioning in a transdiagnostic sample with clinically impairing anhedonia. Stress was also examined in an exploratory manner.

Striatal Dopamine and Anhedonia

Extending previous findings of decreased striatal DA release to rewards in MDD (7,16), we found decreased striatal DA release to rewards in ANH participants. Relative to the CON group, ANH participants exhibited increased [^{11}C]raclopride BP_{ND} in the left and right dorsal striatum and left ventral striatum (*Figure 3*). Interestingly, in the ANH participant group alone, there were no regions that showed a significant change in BP_{ND} from the neutral to reward condition of the MID. This null finding suggests that participants with anhedonia demonstrate a blunted DA response to rewards. Together, these findings represent the first report of decreased phasic DA release to rewards in a transdiagnostic sample with clinically impairing anhedonia.

Reduced striatal DA release to rewards in ANH participants may reflect impaired reward learning (1). The optimized MID task used here required learning which cues predicted differing reward magnitudes, enhancing the sensitivity of the task to positive prediction errors encoded by phasic DA release (46). Though we did not evaluate prediction errors *per se*, impaired modulation of behavior by rewards during a probabilistic reward task is characteristic of anhedonia in individuals with MDD (47,48). Though Hamilton and colleagues (2018) also reported lower tonic levels of DA (i.e., lower availability of DA during baseline or neutral phase) in an MDD sample, our findings are not consistent with this interpretation in the ANH group (16). That is, we did not find evidence that ANH participants were characterized by significantly lower tonic DA relative to CON participants (*Figure 3, for comparisons of neutral phase* BP_{ND}).

Regarding associations between striatal BP_{ND} and anhedonia, we found that increased BP_{ND} in the left putamen, indicative of decreased phasic DA release, was positively associated with anhedonia severity on the BDI-II anhedonia subscale. Within functionally-defined striatal clusters, SHAPS scores were not significantly related to phasic DA reward signaling, which is consistent with at least one [^{11}C]raclopride PET study in MDD (7). These contrasting results between the BDI-II anhedonia subscale and the SHAPS may be due to differences in the aspects of anhedonia that these two scales capture. Whereas the SHAPS primarily assesses aspects of consummatory reward capacity (i.e., pleasure) (49,50), the BDI-II anhedonia subscale captures aspects of both consummatory and anticipatory (i.e., motivation or interest) reward capacity (36,50,51).

fMRI Activation during Reward Anticipation and Reward Outcome

We did not find evidence of altered mesocorticolimbic activation during reward anticipation or reward outcome phases in ANH participants using corrected thresholds (see *Supplemental Materials IIF*). Although the lack of activation differences is inconsistent with prior fMRI research showing hypo-responsivity of striatal regions during anticipatory (1,52,53) and consummatory processing (54–56) in psychiatric populations where anhedonia is a central feature, recent PET-MR investigations of striatal DA binding in MDD likewise did not report group differences in fMRI activation during reward anticipation or reward outcomes (16,18).

Anhedonia and Mesocorticolimbic General Functional Connectivity

The present study also investigated functional connectivity seeded by regions exhibiting blunted striatal DA release to rewards (i.e., PET-derived seeds) using a whole-brain GFC approach. Compared to CON participants, ANH participants showed negative GFC between PET-derived seeds and several regions implicated in reward processing (i.e., bilateral caudate,

putamen, and pallidum), as well as cognitive control (e.g., anterior cingulate gyrus) and control of attention (e.g., thalamus). These results are consistent with reports of altered functional cortico-striatal connectivity in MDD (11,57,58) and a previous [^{11}C]raclopride PET-MR study of functional connectivity in MDD (16). In MDD, increased BP_{ND} in the ventral striatum predicted decreased functional connectivity between PET-derived seeds and default-mode and salience network regions (16).

Impact of Stress on Anhedonia via Striatal Dopamine

Stress is believed to desensitize the mesocorticolimbic DA system and contribute to the maintenance of anhedonic behavior (3,25,59). We hypothesized that self-reported stress on the PSS would predict anhedonia severity and be associated with striatal DA release to rewards, illustrating one potential mechanism linking self-reported stress and anhedonia. This was an exploratory hypothesis, given that the current sample was not selected for their exposure to stress. Consistent with previous work (3,60), perceived stress and scores on the BDI-II anhedonia subscale were highly correlated (r=.47). However, we did not find evidence for the contribution of self-reported stress on mesocorticolimbic DA system functioning. The PSS, our primary measure of self-reported stress, is a retrospective measure that assesses the extent to which stress is unpredictable and uncontrollable during the last month, but it does not assess different types and chronicity of stressors (61). It is possible that other scales that objectively assess stressful life conditions and situations may be better suited to illuminate the role of self-reported stress in DA function. Furthermore, the nucleus accumbens (NAc) is strongly implicated in stress regulation (19) and demonstrates a blunted response during reward consumption in patients with MDD (62). Here, group differences in dopaminergic response to rewards (*Figure 3*) highlighted one small cluster (size=19 voxels) located between the left NAc and left putamen. We may not have

found evidence of a relation between self-reported stress and mesocorticolimbic DA system functioning because these clusters were primarily located outside of the NAc.

Limitations and Future Directions

This study has a number of limitations. First, the sample size, though comparable to many PET studies (63), was modest. Second, given that this is a cross-sectional study, we cannot determine causal relationships between reduced striatal DA release to rewards and anhedonia. Future research should investigate temporal relations between reduced striatal DA release to rewards and anhedonia. Third, the ANH sample was not recruited based on severity of self-reported stress. Although the ANH sample demonstrated moderate levels of stress (see *Table 2*), the mean level of PSS scores was lower than psychiatric samples and the variability of PSS scores was limited (64).

In summary, the present study is the first to investigate phasic striatal DA release to rewards in a transdiagnostic anhedonic sample. This study provides support for the association between blunted striatal DA functioning and transdiagnostic anhedonia. We found blunted general functional connectivity with PET-derived striatal seeds in anhedonia participants, but these group differences were not associated with anhedonia severity. We demonstrated that self-reported stress was strongly associated with anhedonia but was not associated with striatal DA binding. These findings provide support for the association between stress and anhedonia and highlight a potential molecular mechanism of impaired reward processing in anhedonia-related psychopathologies.

Acknowledgments:

This research was supported by R61/R33 MH110027 to GSD and MJS, R21 MH110933 to GSD and JMH, K23 MH113733 to ECW, and UL 1TR002489. DAP was partially supported by R37 MH068376 and R01 MH095809. DD was partially supported by R01 MH111676. The content is solely the responsibility of the author and does not necessarily represent the official views of NIH, Wellcome Leap or the Brain & Behavior Research Foundation.

Disclosures:

Over the past 3 years, Dr. Pizzagalli has received consulting fees from Albright Stonebridge Group, Boehringer Ingelheim, Compass Pathways, Engrail Therapeutics, Neumora Therapeutics (formerly BlackThorn Therapeutics), Neurocrine Biosciences, Neuroscience Software, Otsuka, Sunovion, and Takeda; he has received honoraria from the Psychonomic Society (for editorial work) and from Alkermes; he has received research funding from the Brain and Behavior Research Foundation, the Dana Foundation, Millennium Pharmaceuticals, and NIMH; he has received stock options from Compass Pathways, Engrail Therapeutics, Neumora Therapeutics, and Neuroscience Software. No funding from these entities was used to support the current work, and all views expressed are solely those of the authors. The other authors have no conflicts of interest or relevant disclosures.

References

1. Borsini A, Wallis ASJ, Zunszain P, Pariante CM, Kempton MJ (2020): Characterizing anhedonia: A systematic review of neuroimaging across the subtypes of reward processing deficits in depression. *Cognitive Affect Behav Neurosci* 1–26.

2. Berridge KC, Kringelbach ML (2008): Affective neuroscience of pleasure: reward in humans and animals. *Psychopharmacology* 199: 457–480.

3. Pizzagalli DA (2014): Depression, Stress, and Anhedonia: Toward a Synthesis and Integrated Model. *Clin Psychology* 10: 393–423.

4. Russo SJ, Nestler EJ (2013): The brain reward circuitry in mood disorders. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 14. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3381

5. Schultz W (2019): Recent advances in understanding the role of phasic dopamine activity. *F1000research* 8: F1000 Faculty Rev-1680.

6. Der-Avakian A, Markou A (2012): The neurobiology of anhedonia and other reward-related deficits. *Trends Neurosci* 35: 68–77.

7. Peciña M, Sikora M, Avery ET, Heffernan J, Peciña S, Mickey BJ, Zubieta J-K (2017): Striatal dopamine D2/3 receptor-mediated neurotransmission in major depression: Implications for anhedonia, anxiety and treatment response. *Eur Neuropsychopharm* 27: 977–986.

8. Pizzagalli DA, Berretta S, Wooten D, Goer F, Pilobello KT, Kumar P, *et al.* (2019): Assessment of Striatal Dopamine Transporter Binding in Individuals With Major Depressive Disorder. *Jama Psychiat* 76: 854–861.

9. Husain M, Roiser JP (2018): Neuroscience of apathy and anhedonia: a transdiagnostic approach. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 19: 470–484.

10. Stringaris A, Belil PV-R, Artiges E, Lemaitre H, Gollier-Briant F, Wolke S, *et al.* (2015): The Brain's Response to Reward Anticipation and Depression in Adolescence: Dimensionality, Specificity, and Longitudinal Predictions in a Community-Based Sample. *Am J Psychiat* 172: 1215–1223.

11. Gabbay V, Ely BA, Li Q, Bangaru SD, Panzer AM, Alonso CM, *et al.* (2013): Striatum-Based Circuitry of Adolescent Depression and Anhedonia. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 52: 628-641.e13.

12. Arrondo G, Segarra N, Metastasio A, Ziauddeen H, Spencer J, Reinders NR, *et al.* (2015): Reduction in ventral striatal activity when anticipating a reward in depression and schizophrenia: a replicated cross-diagnostic finding. *Front Psychol* 6: 1280.

13. Liu R, Wang Y, Chen X, Zhang Z, Xiao L, Zhou Y (2021): Anhedonia correlates with functional connectivity of the nucleus accumbens subregions in patients with major depressive disorder. *Neuroimage Clin* 30: 102599.

14. Felger JC, Li Z, Haroon E, Woolwine BJ, Jung MY, Hu X, Miller AH (2015): Inflammation is associated with decreased functional connectivity within corticostriatal reward circuitry in depression. *Mol Psychiatr* 21: 1358–1365.

15. Wacker J, Dillon DG, Pizzagalli DA (2009): The role of the nucleus accumbens and rostral anterior cingulate cortex in anhedonia: Integration of resting EEG, fMRI, and volumetric techniques. *Neuroimage* 46: 327–337.

16. Hamilton JP, Sacchet MD, Hjørnevik T, Chin FT, Shen B, Kämpe R, *et al.* (2018): Striatal dopamine deficits predict reductions in striatal functional connectivity in major depression: a concurrent 11C-raclopride positron emission tomography and functional magnetic resonance imaging investigation. *Transl Psychiat* 8: 264.

17. Schott BH, Minuzzi L, Krebs RM, Elmenhorst D, Lang M, Winz OH, *et al.* (2008): Mesolimbic Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging Activations during Reward Anticipation Correlate with Reward-Related Ventral Striatal Dopamine Release. *J Neurosci* 28: 14311–14319.

18. Schneier FR, Slifstein M, Whitton AE, Pizzagalli DA, Reinen J, McGrath PJ, *et al.* (2018): Dopamine Release in Antidepressant-Naive Major Depressive Disorder: A Multimodal [11C]-(+)-PHNO Positron Emission Tomography and Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging Study. *Biol Psychiat* 84: 563–573.

19. Stanton CH, Holmes AJ, Chang SWC, Joormann J (2018): From Stress to Anhedonia: Molecular Processes through Functional Circuits. *Trends Neurosci* 42: 23–42.

20. Kumar P, Slavich GM, Berghorst LH, Treadway MT, Brooks NH, Dutra SJ, *et al.* (2015): Perceived Chronic Stress Exposure Modulates Reward-Related Medial Prefrontal Cortex Responses to Acute Stress in Depression. *J Affect Disorders* 180: 104–111.

21. Cabib S, Puglisi-Allegra S (2012): The mesoaccumbens dopamine in coping with stress. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 36: 79–89.

22. Willner P, Muscat R, Papp M (1992): Chronic mild stress-induced anhedonia: A realistic animal model of depression. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 16: 525–534.

23. Riga D, Theijs JT, Vries TJD, Smit AB, Spijker S (2015): Social defeat-induced anhedonia: effects on operant sucrose-seeking behavior. *Front Behav Neurosci* 9: 195.

24. Krishnan V, Han M-H, Graham DL, Berton O, Renthal W, Russo SJ, *et al.* (2007): Molecular Adaptations Underlying Susceptibility and Resistance to Social Defeat in Brain Reward Regions. *Cell* 131: 391–404.

25. Hollon NG, Burgeno LM, Phillips PEM (2015): Stress effects on the neural substrates of motivated behavior. *Nat Neurosci* 18: 1405–1412.

26. Soares JM, Sampaio A, Ferreira LM, Santos NC, Marques F, Palha JA, *et al.* (2012): Stress-induced changes in human decision-making are reversible. *Transl Psychiat* 2: e131–e131.

27. Ironside M, Kumar P, Kang M-S, Pizzagalli DA (2018): Brain mechanisms mediating effects of stress on reward sensitivity. *Curr Opin Behav Sci* 22: 106–113.

28. Zürcher NR, Walsh EC, Phillips RD, Cernasov PM, Tseng C-EJ, Dharanikota A, *et al.* (2021): A simultaneous [11C]raclopride positron emission tomography and functional magnetic resonance imaging investigation of striatal dopamine binding in autism. *Transl Psychiat* 11: 33.

29. Franken IHA, Rassin E, Muris P (2007): The assessment of anhedonia in clinical and non-clinical populations: Further validation of the Snaith–Hamilton Pleasure Scale (SHAPS). *J Affect Disorders* 99: 83–89.

30. Kadouri A, Corruble E, Falissard B (2007): The improved Clinical Global Impression Scale (iCGI): development and validation in depression. *Bmc Psychiatry* 7: 7.

31. First M, Karg R, Williams J, Spitzer R (2015): *Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-5-Research Version (SCID-5 for DSM-5, Research Version; SCID-5-RV).* American Psychiatric Association.

32. Cohen S, Kamarck T, Mermelstein R (1983): A Global Measure of Perceived Stress. *J Health Soc Behav* 24: 385.

33. Bernstein DP, Fink L, Handelsman L, Foote J, Lovejoy M, Wenzel K, *et al*. (1994): Initial reliability and validity of a new retrospective measure of child abuse and neglect. *Am J Psychiat* 151: 1132–1136.

34. Blevins CA, Weathers FW, Davis MT, Witte TK, Domino JL (2015): The Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Checklist for DSM□5 (PCL□5): Development and Initial Psychometric Evaluation. *J Trauma Stress* 28: 489–498.

35. Gasperi M, Afari N, Goldberg J, Suri P, Panizzon MS (2021): Pain and Trauma: The Role of Criterion A Trauma and Stressful Life Events in the Pain and PTSD Relationship. *J Pain* 22: 1506–1517.

36. Pizzagalli DA, Jahn AL, O'Shea JP (2005): Toward an objective characterization of an anhedonic phenotype: A signal-detection approach. *Biol Psychiat* 57: 319–327.

37. Papenberg G, Jonasson L, Karalija N, Johansson J, Köhncke Y, Salami A, *et al.* (2019): Mapping the landscape of human dopamine D2/3 receptors with [11C]raclopride. *Brain Struct Funct* 224: 2871–2882.

38. Lammertsma AA, Hume SP (1996): Simplified Reference Tissue Model for PET Receptor Studies. *Neuroimage* 4: 153–158.

39. Sander CY, Hooker JM, Catana C, Rosen BR, Mandeville JB (2016): Imaging Agonist-Induced D2/D3 Receptor Desensitization and Internalization In Vivo with PET/fMRI. *Neuropsychopharmacol* 41: 1427–1436.

40. Elliott ML, Knodt AR, Cooke M, Kim MJ, Melzer TR, Keenan R, *et al.* (2019): General functional connectivity: Shared features of resting-state and task fMRI drive reliable and heritable individual differences in functional brain networks. *Neuroimage* 189: 516–532.

41. Anderson JS, Ferguson MA, Lopez-Larson M, Yurgelun-Todd D (2011): Reproducibility of Single-Subject Functional Connectivity Measurements. *Am J Neuroradiol* 32: 548–555.

42. Team RC (2020): R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Retrieved from https://www.R-project.org/.

43. Benjamani Y, Hochberg Y (1995): A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 57: 289–300.

44. Smarr KL, Keefer AL (2011): Measures of depression and depressive symptoms: Beck Depression Inventory□II (BDI□II), Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES□D), Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS), Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS), and Patient Health Questionnaire□9 (PHQ□9). *Arthrit Care Res* 63: S454–S466.

45. Cohen S, Janicki-Deverts D (2012): Who's Stressed? Distributions of Psychological Stress in the United States in Probability Samples from 1983, 2006, and 20091. *J Appl Soc Psychol* 42: 1320–1334.

46. Berridge KC, Robinson TE (2003): Parsing reward. *Trends Neurosci* 26: 507–513.

47. Vrieze E, Pizzagalli DA, Demyttenaere K, Hompes T, Sienaert P, Boer P de, *et al.* (2013): Reduced Reward Learning Predicts Outcome in Major Depressive Disorder. *Biol Psychiat* 73: 639–645.

48. Pechtel P, Dutra SJ, Goetz EL, Pizzagalli DA (2013): Blunted reward responsiveness in remitted depression. *Journal of Psychiatric Research* 47: 1864–1869.

49. Rizvi SJ, Pizzagalli DA, Sproule BA, Kennedy SH (2016): Assessing anhedonia in depression: Potentials and pitfalls. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 65: 21–35.

50. Snaith RP, Hamilton M, Morley S, Humayan A, Hargreaves D, Trigwell P (1995): A Scale for the Assessment of Hedonic Tone the Snaith–Hamilton Pleasure Scale. *Brit J Psychiat* 167: 99–103.

51. Joiner TE, Brown JS, Metalsky GI (2003): A test of the tripartite model's prediction of anhedonia's specificity to depression: patients with major depression versus patients with schizophrenia. *Psychiat Res* 119: 243–250.

52. Luijten M, Schellekens AF, Kühn S, Machielse MWJ, Sescousse G (2017): Disruption of Reward Processing in Addiction□: An Image-Based Meta-analysis of Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging Studies. *Jama Psychiat* 74: 387.

53. Leroy A, Amad A, D'Hondt F, Pins D, Jaafari N, Thomas P, Jardri R (2020): Reward anticipation in schizophrenia: A coordinate-based meta-analysis. *Schizophr Res* 218: 2–6.

54. Nawijn L, Zuiden M van, Frijling JL, Koch SBJ, Veltman DJ, Olff M (2015): Reward functioning in PTSD: A systematic review exploring the mechanisms underlying anhedonia. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 51: 189–204.

55. Ng TH, Alloy LB, Smith DV (2019): Meta-analysis of reward processing in major depressive disorder reveals distinct abnormalities within the reward circuit. *Transl Psychiat* 9: 293.

56. Zhang B, Lin P, Shi H, Öngür D, Auerbach RP, Wang X, *et al.* (2016): Mapping anhedonia-specific dysfunction in a transdiagnostic approach: an ALE meta-analysis. *Brain Imaging Behav* 10: 920–939.

57. Walsh E, Carl H, Eisenlohr-Moul T, Minkel J, Crowther A, Moore T, *et al.* (2017): Attenuation of Frontostriatal Connectivity During Reward Processing Predicts Response to Psychotherapy in Major Depressive Disorder. *Neuropsychopharmacol* 42: 831–843.

58. Kang L, Zhang A, Sun N, Liu P, Yang C, Li G, *et al.* (2018): Functional connectivity between the thalamus and the primary somatosensory cortex in major depressive disorder: a resting-state fMRI study. *Bmc Psychiatry* 18: 339.

59. Valenti O, Gill KM, Grace AA (2012): Different stressors produce excitation or inhibition of mesolimbic dopamine neuron activity: response alteration by stress pre□exposure. *Eur J Neurosci* 35: 1312–1321.

60. Slavich GM, Irwin MR (2014): From Stress to Inflammation and Major Depressive Disorder: A Social Signal Transduction Theory of Depression. *Psychol Bull* 140: 774–815.

61. Slavich GM, Shields GS (2018): Assessing Lifetime Stress Exposure Using the Stress and Adversity Inventory for Adults (Adult STRAIN). *Psychosom Med* 80: 17–27.

62. Pizzagalli DA, Holmes AJ, Dillon DG, Goetz EL, Birk JL, Bogdan R, *et al.* (2009): Reduced Caudate and Nucleus Accumbens Response to Rewards in Unmedicated Individuals With Major Depressive Disorder. *Am J Psychiat* 166: 702–710.

63. Baumgartner R, Joshi A, Feng D, Zanderigo F, Ogden RT (2018): Statistical evaluation of test-retest studies in PET brain imaging. *Ejnmmi Res* 8: 13.

64. Hewitt PL, Flett GL, Mosher SW (1992): The Perceived Stress Scale: Factor structure and relation to depression symptoms in a psychiatric sample. *J Psychopathol Behav* 14: 247–257.